

The Wreath of the National Park Service: John Reynolds and Terry Carlstrom.

The Wreath of the Naval Lodge No. 4, Masons of the District of Columbia: John Davis, Worshipful Master.

Taps and Retiring of the Colors: Old Guard Fife and Drum Corps and Joint Armed Services Color Guard.

□ 2015

DOWNSIZING GOVERNMENT

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations has completed nine of the ten subcommittee mark ups for our fiscal year 1995 supplemental appropriations and downsizing rescissions bills. Only the Legislative Branch Subcommittee remains to be marked up tomorrow. The results so far are that the various subcommittees have recommended more than \$17 billion in rescissions of previously appropriated funding. If you add to this the \$3.2 billion of rescissions included in the defense supplemental that the House passed on Wednesday, the Committee on Appropriations is developing bills that include over \$20 billion in rescissions.

That is why tonight I take this opportunity to thank my subcommittee chairmen and the members of the Committee on Appropriations, both Republican and Democrat, and all our staff for their serious and fruitful efforts. Through hard work we are making big change, and most importantly, keeping promises to the American people.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order requested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] immediately follow the special order requested by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and that the special order requested by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] immediately follow the special order requested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REFORM WELFARE, BUT NOT AT THE EXPENSE OF CHILDREN

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Members, in response to the last 1 minute, let me talk about what the school lunch and breakfast program really does. We heard, and we are in markup in the Committee on Education and Economic Opportunity, we heard there are not cuts. Let me tell

you what I have from the State of Texas Department of Education agency, but also from Houston Independent School District. That shows that the Republican majority is cutting the school lunch and breakfast program.

The President is right and we need to be honest with the American people. We need to reform welfare, but we do not need to take it out of the mouths of the children and their breakfast or lunch program.

The Republican majority here in the House and the talking heads I see on TV say they are actually providing more funds. But in the State of Texas we would see a 4-percent cut in the school lunch and breakfast program, and that is one we grow every year. So we are cutting 4 percent right now.

Again, we should reform welfare, but not out of the mouths of our children and not out of America's future.

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

Proposed impact of school-based nutrition block grant amendment on Texas' Child Nutrition Program Fiscal Year 1996

Projected by 1996 national funding for school-based child Nutrition Programs (per USDA)	\$6,897,000,000
Proposed funding under block grant amendment .	\$6,626,000,000
Difference*	\$271,000,000
Percent decreases	<3.9%>
Impact on Texas	
Projected FY 1996 school-based child nutrition funding	\$561,000,000
Percent decrease (3.9%) ..	<21,879,000>

Balance available

\$539,121,000

*The difference may be attributable to the inclusion of other programs (Child and Adult Care Food Program and the Summer Food Services Programs) in the determination of the funding levels. Information on these programs may be obtained from the Texas Department of Human Services.

Note: The balance available for FY 1996 is approximately equal to the amount we estimate to disburse in FY 1995. The result, in effect, is to allow for no growth from FY 1995 to FY 1996. In Texas the reimbursement for these programs have increased approximately 8 percent per year for the past five years. The proposed increases in the amendment of approximately 4.6 percent per year would not allow for the current level of growth in these programs.

Proposed impact of school-based nutrition block grant amendment on Houston ISD (HISD) Child Nutrition Program Fiscal Year 1996

Impact on Houston ISD:

Projected fiscal year 1996 School-based child nutrition funding	\$43,000,000
Proposed decrease (3.9%)	<1,677,000>

Balanced available

\$41,323,000

Note: The balance available for FY 1996 is approximately equal to the amount estimated for FY 1995. The result, in effect is to allow for no growth in FY 1996. In the Houston ISD reimbursements for these programs have increased approximately 3 percent per year over the past five years. The proposed increases in the amendment are approximately 4.6 percent per year and would allow for the current level of growth in these programs.

Impact of the proposed school-based nutrition block grant amendment on Houston ISD (HISD) 1995-96 school year

Child nutrition funding:	Millions
Current Projected funding (using 3% growth)	4.27

Funding based on proposal (1.7% assuming an equal distribution of the states reduction in growth) ... 42.2

Projected loss in Child Nutrition funding5

State foundation program funding:

Current Projected funding 215.9

Funding based on proposal 214.0

Projected loss in Foundation Program funding 1.9

Total projected loss for 1995-96 . 2.4

Note: Assuming the state's required increase is 8% (based on the past 5 year history), an amendment to allow only 4.6% would require a 47% reduction in the projected growth to all state programs including the Houston Independent School District (HISD). The projected increase in students qualifying for free and reduced priced meals of 6,528 would have to be limited to 3,721 students. Limiting the number of qualifying students effects the allocation for the Child Nutrition program as well as the State Foundation Program funding for HISD shown above.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LARGENT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

REMEMBERING IWO JIMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I'm here today to talk about a simple tribute paid by an ordinary man to one of the greatest battles and some of the greatest heroes in American history.

Mr. Speaker, today this Chamber is mostly silent, and our attention is focused on the issues of the day.

But 50 years ago this week, the eyes of this House—and indeed all of America—were focused on a small, sulfuric island in the South Pacific, and a group of brave young men who helped save the world.

For 4 years, World War II had raged.

Europe lay in ruins, millions had perished in the death camps, and much of the world was pitched in darkness.

In the South Pacific, most of Japan was out of the reach of United States planes.

But Franklin Roosevelt believed that if United States troops could gain a foothold in the South Pacific, and if our planes had a place nearby to land, then the enemy might soon be vanquished and the war might soon be over.

Fifty years ago this week, that task fell to a group of young marines, in a mission called "Operation Detachment," at a place called Iwo Jima.

The battle was expected to take 14 days. It took 36.

The enemy was so dug in that they were nearly invisible.

Fighting was so fierce that one marine remarked that "you could've held up a cigarette and lit it" with all the fire flying by.